

ethnic background ever does my daughters harm, and I can only imagine the grief that her family is feeling.

When we have felons in Federal custody or State or local custody with warrants for drug crimes who are deported multiple times and come back, this Congress has not done its job, unfairly leaving States and localities to cope with decades of inaction on immigration, criminal justice, and a range of other issues. I have no sympathy for the man accused in this crime. Murderers should rot in hell.

So if we had a system that allowed people who have lived here a long time, contributed productively to American society, and who have children and other deep roots in the United States, what if we allowed them to come forward? What if we made them pay for their own criminal background checks, fingerprinted them, made them prove their identity, and check on them every so often to make sure that they are not gaming the system or committing crime?

What if we had a system where people came here legally in the first place, if they could prove their identity and that they had no criminal background?

I argue that such a system would allow us to reduce significantly the number of people who are in this country without legal status. It would shrink the size of communities where many people are undocumented, where people are afraid to call the police so that criminals find it easy to blend in and not stick out. Such a system would allow us to concentrate our enforcement and deportation resources on real criminals who should be jailed and then thrown out and kept out.

□ 1015

I argue that such a system would make it harder for criminals to hide and easier for honest, hard-working folks to contribute to their communities without fear. Unfortunately, that is exactly the system that some Republicans have been fighting against.

When a hotel and casino owner gets on his high horse about Mexican immigrants, about crime, rape, and murder, let's think about who is standing between the United States—this country, the one that we love and we have sworn to protect—and a modern immigration system based on common sense, compassion, and, yes, the rule of law.

TIME FOR HEALTHCARE SOLUTIONS THAT LOWER COSTS AND EMPOWER PATIENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, for the past 2 years, my email inbox, mailbox, and phone lines have been flooded with reports of canceled health insurance plans, soaring premiums, increased deductibles, and exasperated constitu-

ents trying to navigate the confusing Washington bureaucracy that is ObamaCare.

Members of Congress have to buy their health insurance on the ObamaCare exchanges along with millions of other Americans, and I experienced many of the same frustrations, including the nightmare of navigating a confusing, unfinished Web site.

Despite its central promise, the Affordable Care Act has proved to be anything but affordable for many North Carolinians, and the Supreme Court's recent decision in *King v. Burwell* doesn't change that fact.

House Republicans are continuing our efforts to minimize the damage caused by ObamaCare. We have passed legislation that would permanently repeal ObamaCare's 2.3 percent excise tax on medical devices, which has hindered innovation as well as restricted growth and job creation in an industry that has improved the quality of life of millions around the world.

We have voted to repeal the Independent Payment Advisory Board, which was created under the President's healthcare law and gives a panel of 15 unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats sweeping authority to slash Medicare payments to providers or eliminate payments for certain treatments and procedures altogether.

The House has passed legislation that would change ObamaCare's 30-hour definition of full-time employment and restore the traditional 40-hour workweek. From adjunct professors to hourly workers, I have heard from constituents across North Carolina's Fifth District who have one thing in common: their hours are being reduced.

ObamaCare has placed an undue burden on employers and their employees by undermining the 40-hour workweek, which has long been the standard for full-time work.

We have voted to make it easier to hire veterans by exempting those who already have health insurance from being counted as full-time employees under the President's healthcare law. No employer should be penalized for hiring a veteran, and no veteran should be unemployed because of ObamaCare.

However, the best approach to solving the multitude of problems resulting from ObamaCare is to unite behind a complete repeal of the law and replace it with solutions that lower costs and empower patients to choose the care that is right for them.

I recently signed on as a cosponsor of H.R. 2653, the American Health Care Reform Act. This bill would repeal ObamaCare completely and allow a standard deduction for health insurance that treats individually purchased plans and employer-sponsored plans the same, making sure that all Americans receive the same tax benefits for health care.

H.R. 2653 would return decisions about healthcare and insurance coverage to patients. It is people, not government, who can best determine the

coverage and services that meet their needs.

A government takeover of health care is not what Americans asked for and certainly not what we can afford.

STAND UP AGAINST RIGHT TO WORK LAWS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, Ronald Reagan once said: "Where free unions and collective bargaining are forbidden, freedom is lost."

When President Reagan made those remarks in 1980, he recognized then what many can't seem to understand now: efforts to undermine unions are an attack on workers' rights.

Unions have long been the foundation of our middle class and helped create the most competitive workforce in the world. The 40-hour workweek, minimum wage, sick leave, workers comp, overtime pay, and child labor laws are just a few of the basic labor rights that unions have championed over the years that many now take for granted; yet for all the good that unions have done to empower all workers across this country, there has been a recent revival in the war against them, and the weapon of choice has been right to work laws.

Don't be fooled by the name. The only thing right to work laws do is unfairly allow free-riding workers to benefit from union-negotiated contracts without having to contribute their fair share in the fight. The laws do not, as many supporters complain, protect workers from being forced to become union members. In fact, Federal law already restricts this.

In union States, workers covered by union-negotiated contracts can only be required to pay for the cost of bargaining and not for any other union activities.

However, over the last few years, there has been an alarming increase in antiunion sentiment. Currently, half of our States have right to work laws, with Indiana, Michigan, and Wisconsin recently passing their own versions.

In my own home State of Illinois, Governor Rauner has made passing right to work a top priority. In fact, he is making this a cornerstone of his first-term legislative agenda.

The idea behind his right to work law is that by increasing the number of free-riding workers, unions will be forced to drastically reduce their budgets, weakening their ability to negotiate stronger contracts and defend the rights of American workers, but the evidence clearly shows how misguided this stance is and the attacks on organized labor truly are. For instance, research shows that 7 of the 10 States with the highest unemployment rates are right to work States.

On top of that, we know that even if half of the counties in Illinois adopt right to work laws, we would see the

State's annual economic output shrink by \$1.5 billion, labor income fall by \$1.3 billion, and an increase in both racial and gender income inequality.

If right to work laws are not actually good for the economy, what are they good for? Right to work laws do a great job at harming hard-working middle class families, widening income inequality, and weakening unions. Right to work States have seen almost a 10 percent decline in unionization, which has undermined growth in wages and led to the deterioration in workplace safety.

In right to work States, wages for all workers, not just unionized workers, are over 3 percent lower than in non-right to work States. That is about \$1,500 less per year in the pockets of teachers, firefighters, nurses, and other hard-working Americans.

Furthermore, injuries and deaths in right to work States are much higher than in non-right to work States. In the high-risk environment of construction, where unions have played a fundamental role in demanding adequate safety standards, deaths are 34 percent higher in right to work States than in non-right to work States.

As you can see, right to work is not right for our country, not right for our States, and not right for our workers. Using right to work as a strategy to lower wages and attract more businesses is not a suitable and sustainable strategy.

Instead of focusing on attacking unions and middle class workers, Governors should focus on fixing broken budgets and investing in our schools, public safety programs, and transportation systems. That is the real recipe for economic success.

Let's stand up against right to work laws and stand up for the right to organize, the right to a safe job, and the right to a fair wage.

HONORING DR. PETER SCHRAMM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Peter Schramm of the Ashbrook Center at Ashland University in Ashland, Ohio. Earlier this week, the Ashbrook Center, supporters, and friends gathered to recognize Dr. Schramm for his years of service and to name the center's library in his honor.

Since 1987, Dr. Schramm has been teaching political science at Ashland; mentoring students; and shaping the minds of the next generation of teachers, lawyers, and political thinkers.

His story starts in Hungary, as a young boy living under the brutal Soviet regime. When he was 10, after the Communists crushed the Hungarian uprising in 1956, Peter's father decided it was time to leave Hungary and come to America. Peter asked his father why he chose America, and he was told: "We were born Americans but in the wrong place."

After leaving Hungary, the Schramm family found their way to California, thanks to an American dentist his father met shortly after World War II.

With just a few American dollars, Peter's family started a new life. His parents found work, and Peter and his sister went to school. Peter did not know English and had to learn along the way, with the help of his classmates.

Eventually, they saved enough money to open a restaurant. The whole family worked there. Peter continued his studies and worked through college. He studied history and graduated, taking a few years longer than usual because he was unaware he actually had to graduate. Peter was content to learn for the sake of learning. Years later, he once said: "I think it is true that human beings by nature desire to know."

His economic curiosity led him to Claremont for his master's and doctorate degrees. It was there that he studied the classics, focusing more on philosophy than history.

When he began teaching, Dr. Schramm insisted on an open discussion, encouraging and directing debates among his students. He once said: "A good education is a conversation."

He didn't want to lecture his students and believes that a classic liberal arts education should teach its students how to read, to analyze, and to explain and defend their beliefs.

The Ashbrook Center, where he served as executive director and senior fellow of the scholar program, states that their mission is to restore and strengthen the capacities of the American people for constitutional self-government. Having witnessed the corruption and horror of the Soviet rule, he was able to impress upon his students how important Ashbrook's missions and values are.

One of his most recent students and an intern in my office, James Coyne, told me: "Dr. Schramm has dedicated his life to preserving and perpetuating American greatness by teaching us what it means to be an American. The many of us he has taught will continue his work and honor his legacy by educating future generations on what makes America great."

Dr. Schramm, who is battling an aggressive illness, can be assured that the principles of self-government of free men with free minds and the values that our Founding Fathers cherished are alive and well in the generations of students he has taught.

On Monday evening, Dr. Schramm said that, despite his medical condition, no man has been happier than he has been.

Thank you, Dr. Schramm, for adopting America as your home and teaching so many young minds to keep the flame of freedom burning.

DARK PERIOD IN AMERICAN HISTORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from

North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express the utter outrage of the Congressional Black Caucus regarding the Calvert amendment, scheduled for later this afternoon, which is an amendment to the Interior Appropriations bill.

That amendment would allow Confederate imagery to remain on graves on Federal lands. Don't Republicans understand that the Confederate battle flag is an insult to 40 million African Americans and to many other fair-minded Americans?

The Confederate battle flag, Mr. Speaker, is intended to defend a dark period of American history, a period when 4 million Blacks were held as slaves, held as property, as chattel, not as human beings. The slaves were bought and sold and mortgaged and gifted as chattel.

Mr. Speaker, this period of enslavement continued for more than 200 years and did not legally end until December 6, 1865.

Here is the history, Mr. Speaker. Following President Lincoln's election in November 1860, 12 Southern States ceded from the Union in response to their belief that President Lincoln would free the 4 million slaves. South Carolina was the first State to cede from the Union, on December 20, right after Lincoln's election.

These Southern States formed the Confederate States of America. They empowered a military, elected a President, adopted a constitution, and adopted a currency. They engaged in a brutal, brutal civil war with the Union. Thousands of lives were lost on both sides of the battle. The Confederate flag, Mr. Speaker, was their symbol; it was their flag.

The Southern States lost the war. The States then rejoined the Union. President Lincoln then proposed the 13th Amendment, legally ending slavery. That amendment, Mr. Speaker, passed this Congress on January 31, 1865, and finally was ratified by Georgia on December 6, 1865. During the period of ratification, President Lincoln was assassinated.

For the next 50-plus years, every Black person living in the South faced the possibility of lynching. More than 4,000 Blacks were lynched between 1890 and 1950, and 136 Black people were lynched in South Carolina.

There are some now who want to continue to honor slavery and to honor bigotry, and this House, Mr. Speaker, must not be complicit.

The horrific shooting in Charleston, South Carolina, was an example of a 21st century lynching.

□ 1030

The manifesto left by the Charleston killer stated:

I have no choice. I am not in the position to, alone, go into the ghetto and fight. I chose Charleston because it is the most historic city in my State, and at one time had